

City of San José
Coyote Valley Specific Plan

Summary of Technical Advisory Meeting #27
May 1, 2007
City Hall, Council Wing Room W-118 & W-119

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members Present

Michele Beasley (Greenbelt Alliance), Dawn Cameron (SCC Roads and Airports), Steve Fisher (VTA), Mike Griffis (SCC Roads and Airports), Bernardo Hernandez (HNTB/Joint Powers Board), Trixie Johnson (Friends of the Greenbelt), Libby Lucas (California Native Plant Society), Jane Mark (Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation Department), Elish Ryan (Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation Department), Brian Schmidt (Committee for Green Foothills), Bonnie Tognazzini (Morgan Hill Unified School District), and Kerry Williams (Coyote Housing Group).

City and Other Public Agencies Staff Present

Darryl Boyd (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Jared Hart (PBCE), and Stefanie Hom (PBCE).

Consultants Present

Jodi Starbird (David J. Powers) and Eileen Goodwin (APEX Strategies).

Community Members Present (Additional people were present; however, they did not sign in.)

1. Welcome and Introductions

The meeting convened at approximately 3:00 p.m. with Eileen Goodwin, of APEX Strategies, welcoming everyone to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting. Everyone introduced themselves and indicated what agency they are representing.

2. Agenda Review

Eileen went over the meeting agenda and the packet materials. She indicated that the green comment card included in the packet is to provide written comments on the DEIR; staff would respond to these comments and include them in the final EIR.

3. Overview of the Coyote Valley Specific Plan DEIR

Darryl Boyd, Principal Planner with the Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, presented an overview of the Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR), which is available on the CVSP website at www.sanjoseca.gov/coyotevalley. He explained the purpose of an EIR, discussed the CVSP project description, gave a summary of the findings in the CVSP Draft EIR, and reviewed the next steps in the EIR process.

4. TAC Members Comments and Questions an

The TAC provided the following questions and comments:

- Parts of the plan are going to be unfunded, such as VTA light rail. What do you do with unfunded mitigation measures? *Darryl indicated that the assumption is that developers would pay for the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) improvements within the project area. There is no plan for light rail in or extending to Coyote Valley and VTA is not assumed to pay.*
- Transit is an important part of the Plan. The BRT would be on a fixed guideway.
- Should look for funding sources for desirable components of the Plan.
- The wildlife corridor along Fisher Creek and Coyote Creek should remain. The County riparian corridor setback is 115' to 150'; 150' should be the minimum for Coyote Valley. *Darryl indicated that the City riparian corridor policy setback is 100', as measured from the top of the bank or the edge of the riparian vegetation, whichever is a greater distance. Along Coyote Creek, if measured from the edge of the stream, the distance is between 200' – 800' away. So the separation from the creek is more substantial than the minimum required setback. When Fisher Creek is realigned, the minimum cross-section would be 300'-wide. More information can be found in the technical appendix.*
- Student generation rates for the school district could increase traffic by 5,000 to 7,000 commuters. What type of research has been done on how kids would get to school? Not all kids would go to school in Coyote Valley in the beginning, because there would be little development. *Darryl indicated the traffic analysis includes information on trips generated by schools. The issue is an operational measure, not an environmental issue.*
- The road curvature for the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) alignment is too sharp for light rail. It would not be able to be replaced by LRT in the future.
- The LESA model for determining agriculture lands has some issues when near urban areas. *Darryl indicated the LESA method is encouraged by CEQA.*
- Advanced treated water is energy intensive. Is that analyzed in the EIR? *Darryl indicated that the Water Pollution Control Plant and that the Santa Clara Water District are looking at doing advanced scale water projects to see how energy intensive the process is. There will need to be advanced treated water, regardless of whether the CVSP gets built.*
- Page 11 in the Draft EIR indicates the level of environmental review provided. What would trigger additional environmental review? *Darryl indicated the Draft EIR is written at both a*

project and program level. As the project goes forward, a determination will be made on the need for more environmental analysis on a project by project basis.

- The farming mitigation slide was not presented to the Task Force, but should be. The Draft EIR should indicate that it rejects an alternative mitigation for the conversion of agricultural land. *Darryl indicated that the EIR proposes a 1:1 mitigation for conversion of 2,400 acres important agricultural land.*
- Page 115 of the Draft EIR is interpreted that there would not be mitigation for the conversion of agricultural land. *Darryl clarified that the EIR is not rejecting mitigation, but even with the 1:1 mitigation, it is not sufficient to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.*
- Should include two different mitigations on agricultural land for more clarification.
- The Santa Clara Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) is not using the LESA model to define agriculture land. The City should be consistent with LAFCO. *Darryl indicated that the definition LAFCO uses for agriculture mitigation is different than the definition used by CEQA. The Draft EIR must conform to CEQA.*
- If impacts from the water treatment plant are identified now, why not include that information in the EIR? *Darryl indicated that there is no sufficient level of detail on the project details. There would need to be a more detailed engineer analysis and further environmental review.*
- Should include all known impacts in the EIR.
- Is the 100' riparian corridor policy for Coyote Valley going to be firm? *Yes. Darryl indicated the policy would be firm. Staff had their biologist and County Parks staff use GPS equipment to measure from the top of bank. There were some places that were encroaching into the setback, but everything has been pulled back to meet the 100' setback.*
- There is a discrepancy with employment numbers. Previously informed that there would be an additional 7% of jobs beyond the required 50,000 jobs, but the traffic analysis indicates there would be 17% additional jobs. *Susan Walsh, Senior Planner with the Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, indicated that page 15 of the Draft EIR explains there would be 50,000 industry driving jobs, and an additional 5,000 service jobs. So there would be an additional 10% of jobs beyond the required 50,000. Hexagon has analyzed trips for all jobs.*
- Would Gavilan College own their own land? *Yes.*
- Should there be a hold on the Plan since the City does not have control of Gavilan College? *No. Darryl indicated they have redistributed the jobs and residential that would be taken up by Gavilan College, so it is accounted for in the Plan. There is also discussion of Gavilan College working with the Morgan Hill Unified School District (MHUSD).*
- Bonnie Tognazzini, Deputy Superintendent of the Morgan Hill Unified School District, indicated that MHUSD and Gavilan College are discussing working together to share facilities (i.e. parking and sport fields). The concept would include a larger high school campus in the Core area and a smaller magnet campus at Gavilan College.
- Would the traffic analysis include impacts created by Gavilan College? *Yes. Darryl indicated the traffic analysis assumes industrial development on the college site and is therefore a more conservative approach. The traffic generated by Gavilan College would typically not be peak hour traffic. They have had discussions with Gavilan College and feel the EIR adequately addresses the issue.*

- Traffic generated by Gavilan College would affect peak-hour commutes. Suggested to revise the traffic analysis. *Darryl indicated that staff can double-check the data. Gavilan College would also do their own environmental analysis as part of their project planning effort.*
- Would the high school site by the lake be reduced if there is an additional site? *Bonnie Tognazzini indicated that the size of the main campus by the lake would be reduced. The smaller magnet campus at Gavilan College would not be on Gavilan-owned land. The shared facilities would be on either Gavilan land or MHUSD land.*
- Is the latest illustrative land-use plan with plan refinements available in an electronic format? *No. There may be some maps available by the next Task Force meeting on May 21.*
- How would the proposed trail routes be designed with infrastructure? *Darryl indicated that the details would be finalized during the design of the interchanges.*
- Is information available about the existing drainage and proposed grading on the west side of Monterey Highway? *Yes. Darryl indicated that the area west of Monterey Highway does not all drain to the same places. Some areas drain under Monterey Hwy and come into CVSP proper. The section at the northerly end may need a small detention basin.*
- Is information on the stormwater management plan available? *Yes. Darryl indicated that more detailed design information would be available at a later stage of the Plan.*
- What percentage of properties was not accessible? *Darryl estimated about 30 – 40% of the acreage was not accessible. They looked at aerial photos for information. Even if they did have access to those properties, it would not have changed the information in the EIR.*
- The maps in the appendices, particularly in the biology and hydrology section, are not in color. It is difficult to read.
- Does the EIR make any allowances to adopt additional mitigation measures? *Yes. Darryl indicated that when specific projects are proposed, there may be additional analysis.*
- Does mitigation acreage include acreages not analyzed? *Yes. Darryl indicated it was analyzed upon the Specific Plan with information they had at the time. They may not need additional analysis, but it is dependent on the level of the project.*
- For impacts that need further investigation, what are some issues that would be in the follow-up analysis? *Darryl indicated that for properties that they did not have access to, they would look at all possible environmental impacts.*
- Were mitigation measures for Bailey Over the Hill based on two lanes in each direction? *Darryl did not recall without referring to the traffic report.*
- The South County Circulation study was based on one lane in each direction for Bailey Over the Hill.
- Forty percent (the inaccessible land) is a substantial amount. *Darryl indicated that a lot of analysis was done with aerial photographs and appropriate assumptions made for purpose of environmental analysis. Anything they were unable to look at has some uncertainty.*
- The inputs for farmland are based upon the maps provided by other agencies.
- Was farmland part of the inaccessible land? *Darryl indicated that information on farmland was based on maps provided by other agencies and City's analysis.*
- Page 305 in the Draft EIR indicates mitigation for impacts to wildlife movement. There is lack of information on how effective the mitigation would be. What does it mean when it indicates that mitigations should be done “where possible”? Has there been analysis on whether the 100' riparian corridor buffer would work in reducing the wildlife movement

impact to a less than significant level? *Darryl indicated that they are doing more feasibility analysis as part of the plan refinement process.*

- Concerned with changes to the plan coming out later because the commenting period would already be closed. *Darryl indicated that plan refinements may be out before the Draft EIR commenting period closes and the risk is understood and acknowledged.*
- Traffic generated by Gavilan College would add to the residential traffic. *Darryl indicated they double-counted the jobs, so they ended up with the worst case scenario. Land uses at Gavilan College and the relocated jobs are already accounted for.*
- Page 420 of the Draft EIR deals with global climate change. Did not understand what the threshold of significance is. *Darryl indicated that there was not enough information to draw conclusions and that a threshold of significance has not been established.*
- Page 415 of the Draft EIR references a pending Federal court case. A decision has already been made. *Darryl indicated that they will edit that as part of the final EIR.*
- Grassland is mischaracterized. It is an important area.
- Would the TAC be emailed the revised PowerPoint presentation? *Darryl indicated they would post it online.*

5. Public Comments

There were no public comments received.

6. Review of next Steps in DEIR Process

Darryl indicated the Draft EIR comment period commenced on March 30, 2007, and will end on June 29, 2007. The comment period has been extended from its original date, from 60 days to 90 days, per the request of the public. After comments have been received on the Draft EIR, they will start the plan refinement process and the financing strategy plan.

The TAC provided the following questions and comments:

- How are the court reporters notes going to work? *Susan indicated they would provide a normal meeting summary.*
- Could plan refinements trigger the recirculation of the Draft EIR? *Susan indicated that plan refinements would be coming to the TAC and the Task Force for comments and input. The need for recirculation would be assessed after the plan refinements are completed.*

7. Adjourn

Eileen Goodwin thanked everyone for coming to the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:00 p.m.